UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA OAKLAND DIVISION

United States of America,) Case No. CR 12 -00 393 S I
Plaintiff, v.	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT The state of the state
Luis Sandoval Damian Defendant.) MAY 1 8 2012
by the continuance outweigh the best interest of	richard w. Wieking ord on, 2012, the Good finds that the ends of justice served of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):
Failure to grant a continuance v See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(yould be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. i).
defendants, the nature of or law, that it is unreasonable to	mplex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial blished by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
Failure to grant a continuance v taking into account the exercise	would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
Failure to grant a continuance v counsel's other scheduled case (See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. iv).
Failure to grant a continuance we necessary for effective preparate See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time ion, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. iv).
IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: 5/17/12	LAUREL BEELER United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendar	Assistant United States Attorney